

Date: Sat, 28 May 94 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #225
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 28 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 225

Today's Topics:

Assault on Theory? (was Re: CW speed? When will the wingers stop ??)
CW is fun!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 27 May 1994 08:07:38 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
news.msfc.nasa.gov!news.larc.nasa.gov!lerc.nasa.gov!kira.cc.uakron.edu!
malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.
Subject: Assault on Theory? (was Re: CW speed? When will the wingers stop ??)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994May26.005043.31522@ucl.ac.uk>, Redvers Llewellyn Davies
(zcap134@ucl.ac.uk) writes:

> Being serious for a moment though, the way I look at this is this.
>The blurb on my licence says that my station is for "... the self-education of
>the licensee for the establishment..." Blah... etc. IE: The idea being that
>the amateur system was for radio training.

>
> Now, hands up all these people who use their calls for research, or
>self-training...???

>
> Originally to get a UK licence you needed a plan of research. This
>would then be approved or thrown out. How many people would qualify for that?
>

> Now, the only REAL barrier is CW. People state that CW is un-needed.
>Fine, why don't we abolish the radio theory exam too, I mean, who needs radio
>theory to operate one of these new "Black-Box" radios???

>

Regardless of what any of us thinks of CW, I have believed for a long time that an assault on the theory is inevitable. I already hear the arguments on the air, and they have a strangely familiar ring to them:

"Why should I have to learn this stuff when I can buy equipment that works better than anything I could build? And besides, if it breaks I sure as hell can't fix it! Why live in the past when there are professional engineers and manufacturing giants who every day advance the state of the art beyond what the average ham could ever understand? Why waste time on theory which could better be spent on some other area of the hobby? After all, two-transistor transmitters are quaint, but, really, they have nothing to do with modern communication electronics." And on and on.

Heard this before? It's there, and it will get stronger, not weaker. I think this attitude is the most dangerous threat of all to the institution of amateur radio. It's just so easy to buy a shiny new radio and be on the air in minutes (assuming you can tell the red wire from the black one). Need the theory for safety reasons? Not really, just a few questions on the test, things like not putting your tongue on your open-wire feedline when transmitting, and not touching anything that makes a spark longer than your thumb, stuff like that. After all, the manufacturers can just put more safety warnings and interlocks on their equipment, just like microwaves, washing machines and other appliances.

Yes, the state of the radio art keeps advancing farther and farther from the ability of the average ham to understand, just as world track records are constantly being broken. But youngsters still need a safe place to learn to walk, and a society that wants to produce and understand technology rather than just buy technology must have places where it's people can learn the same basics that must be learned by each generation. I just think the pressure for "easier, more relevant" requirements may be irresistible.

Mike, KK6GM

Date: Fri, 27 May 1994 07:24:49 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.msfc.nasa.gov!
news.larc.nasa.gov!lerc.nasa.gov!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!
mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: CW is fun!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2s0gar\$fva@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, Dana Myers (myers@spot.West.Sun.COM) writes:

>In article 275@ted.win.net, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:
>>And that's why a knowledge of horsemanship is required to get a HF'ania
>>drivers license.
>

>No, the reason the horsemanship is required is because HF'mania is
>a member of a treaty that requires horsemanship for travel between
>countries, and the treaty hasn't been updated quite yet.

Well, sure, I could have said "And that's why HF'ania and all the other lands got together and included horsemanship in their road treay."
But I think that always talking about "the treaty" suggests that "it" (the code requirement) is somehow imposed on the U.S. from on high. I think that the way it really works is that every country brings it's own notion of what is in it's own best interest to the treaty table, and lots of countries felt that the code was important enough for their amateurs that it be included as a treaty item. The point being that the code requirement is in the treaty *because* it was desired by the signatories, not that the requirement has somehow been *imposed* on a lot of reluctant countries.

>
>But, yeah, CW is fun. Doesn't mean it should be a hard test requirement, though.
>

I can't make up my own mind on the subject, although I do have leanings. I was just trying to point out the errors in what is becoming an anti-code cliché.

Mike, KK6GM

Date: Fri, 27 May 1994 08:15:08 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem60.ucdavis.edu!ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <hamilton.768924220@BIX.com>, <051694162854Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CqBx77.EHs@news.Hawaii.Edu>, ¥
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <CqBx77.EHs@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>Wrong wrong wrong. There are just as many if not more CW QSOs being conducted
>as compared to any other mode at any one time. [I'm going to have everyone
>saying this in their sleep.]

Are you suggesting that jyou count all the QSO's in all modes on all freqs to
get this number? Or are you only counting HF that you can hear on the bands
you chhose to listen to when you choose to listen? Is this a scientic random
sample of ALL the ham bands? NO I don't think anyone has that ability. Voice
is more popular and used more frequently by hams than morse code is. Or are
you suggesting that the CW contacts of the 38% of hams who use morse code (not
to the exclusion of other modes) make up over 50% of the QSO's at any one time?

Dan

```
=====
Dan Todd          ddtodd@ucdavis.edu          kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na
Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX
-----
When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy
=====
```

```
-----
Date: Fri, 27 May 1994 08:21:44 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem60.ucdavis.edu!
ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu
```

References <1994May20.131935.26764@cs.brown.edu>, <9RsTmc2w165w@w2up.wells.com>,
<1994May25.132144.7176@cs.brown.edu>, p
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <1994May25.132144.7176@cs.brown.edu> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael
P. Deignan) writes:

>Alternatively, I would suggest that an initial waiver be obtained from
>your normal MD, and an panel of FCC-contracted MDs can review medical
>records and request additional information as necessary.
We can't even get the FCC to look at a potential jammer, even with tape
recordings etc. (if recent posts are to be believed) Why do expect them to
ever review a medical waiver? The FCC doesn't really give a rat's tail
whether we have a code requirement or not, they probably don't even care about
licensing if we could really self police. All they care about is keeping us
out of their hair. If they'll stay out of mine we've got a deal.

Dan

=====
Dan Todd ddtodd@ucdavis.edu kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na
Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX

When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy
=====

Date: Fri, 27 May 1994 08:09:42 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!
modem60.ucdavis.edu!ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <hamilton.768924952@BIX.com>, <ddtodd.89.0008D30A@ucdavis.edu>,
<CqBwv9.EFH@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <CqBwv9.EFH@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey
Herman) writes:

>From: jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)

>Subject: Re: Code test speeds

>Keywords: Phooey.

>Date: Tue, 24 May 1994 22:52:20 GMT

>In article <ddtodd.89.0008D30A@ucdavis.edu> ddtodd@ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:

>> You keep saying that cw is just as important as it has always

>>been. This is simply not true. The ARRL did a survey recently.

>The survey said that almost 40% of hams operate CW (not exclusive of other
>modes). But trying listening to 40M in the evening and what you'll actually
>hear is at least 50% of all QSOs are being conducted using CW.

It is not surprising that on 40m much of the ham traffic will be CW. This is
due to the fact that most of the voice portion of 40m is destroyed by
SWBroadcasters.

>CW is just as important as it has always been.

No, it is not. There was a time when morse code was the only way of sending
data over the airwaves. My previous usage of CW was incorrect. since before
100% of the traffic was Morse code and now only 40% of the active hams ever
use morse code it is less important than it once was.

dan

=====
Dan Todd ddtodd@ucdavis.edu kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na

Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX

When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy

=====

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #225
